

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 are pending, Claims 1, 4 and 5 having been amended and Claim 6 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. As the amendments to Claims 1, 4 and 5 are made as a matter of form, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action the Title was objected to; Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claim 6 was rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter; and Claims 1-6 were rejected as being anticipated by Harada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,486,890, hereinafter “Harada”).

In reply, the Title has been amended as suggested.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the predetermined content is divided into a plurality of blocks to be consecutively displayed. The content data includes positional data which relates to the blocks and which is for setting a position of a subsequent block described relative to the position of a previous block. Thus, because the blocks are consecutively displayed, the positional data of the blocks may be described relative to one another (a previous block, provides a point of reference for a subsequent block). Thus it is believed that Claim 1, as amended, complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 4 and 5 are similarly amended. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that these three claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. However, if the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that mutually agreeable claim language may be identified.

Claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaims and therefore the rejection of Claim 6 is now moot.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to an information processing device that includes a display control means for controlling display of the predetermined content based on stored content data. As discussed above, the predetermined content is divided into a plurality of blocks to be consecutively displayed. The content data includes positional data which relates to the blocks and which is for setting a position of a subsequent block described relative to the position of a previous block. The display control means controls the display of the predetermined content by, based on the position data, subsequently controlling display of one predetermined block in a predetermined position in units of the blocks.

Harada is asserted as disclosing all the features of Claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Harada is directed to an apparatus and method for displaying images. The outstanding Office Action relies on Figures 21(a, b, and c) as disclosing the predetermined content divided into a plurality of blocks to be consecutively displayed. Moreover, the outstanding Office Action refers to the nine reference points as being “blocks”. As shown in Figure 21c, the outstanding Office Action refers to the “blocks” as being reference points 5 and 1. Harada discloses these features, as being “magnified areas”. The outstanding Office Action then hypothesizes that the “column data” described at column 15, lines 26-27 includes the “positional data” as claimed in order to assert that the display control means controls using the positional data. Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion.

As a preliminary matte, each of the reference points, are just that, reference points and not “blocks”. The reference points are merely places on a page to provide magnification points (see, e.g., column 13, lines 43-55). The dashed areas in Figure 21(c) are actually “transparent films” which are helpful in detecting the position when the screen is touched by a finger or a pen (see, e.g., column 22, lines 41-42).

As to the “positional data”, the Office Action relies on column 15, lines 26-27.

However, this language in Harada merely refers to language on a page that is shown in a columnar format but in no way suggests the division of predetermined content into a plurality of blocks that are consecutively displayed, where the content itself includes positional data. Furthermore, the claim requires that the display control means controls the display of the predetermined content based on the positional data subsequently controlling display of one predetermined block in a predetermined position in units of the blocks. Harada simply does not teach or suggest this feature. The content itself does not include positional data and therefore the control means cannot correspond with the claimed feature of controlling the display of the predetermined content based on the position data subsequently controlling display of one predetermined block.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Harada does not disclose the feature of (1) the predetermined content divided into a plurality of blocks to be consecutively displayed where the content data includes positional data, and (2) a display control means that controls the display of the predetermined content based on the positional data. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Harada does not disclose all of the elements of amended Claim 1.

Although of differing statutory class and/or scope, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-5 also patentably define over Harada.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-5 as amended,

is definite and patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

I:\ATTY\BDL\243073US-AM.DOC